



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/883,301	06/19/2001	Jeffrey A. Bedell	53470.003029	9724
21967 7590 04/11/2008 HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 1900 K STREET, N.W. SUITE 1200 WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1109				
EXAMINER				
PATEL, CHIRAG R				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2141				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/11/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/883,301
Filing Date: June 19, 2001
Appellant(s): BEDELL ET AL.

Jeffrey A. Bedell et al.
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed December 21, 2007 appealing from the Office action mailed December 21, 2007.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

7,062,563	Lewis	1-2006
2001/0049717	Freeman	12-2001

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-5, 7-11, and 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lewis (US 7,062,563)

As per claims 1, 7, and 13, Lewis discloses a method for implementing database connection mapping for connecting a user to at least one database in a reporting system, comprising the steps of:

enabling a user to submit a user identification input and a user request to a reporting system; (Col 5 lines 49-60, Col 7 line 47 – Col 8 line 5)

identifying the user based on user identification input; and (Col 10 lines 37-52)

controlling access to at least one database through a centralized server wherein the centralized server maps the user to at least one appropriate database based on the user request and at least one database connection definition. (Col 7 line 47 – Col 8 line 5, Col 10 lines 37-52)

As per claim 2, 8, and 14, Lewis discloses the method of claim 1 wherein the database connection definition comprises a data source name and a set of properties for establishing a database connection to at least one database. (Col 10 lines 37-52)

As per claims 3, 9, and 15, Lewis discloses the method of claim 2 wherein the data source name comprises information for locating and logging into a database. (Col 10 lines 37-52)

As per claims 4, 10, and 16, Lewis discloses the method of claim 2 wherein the database connection comprises a physical open database connectivity connection to a database. (Col 10 lines 23-36)

As per claims 5, 11, and 17, Lewis discloses the method of claim 1 wherein the user is associated with a group of users where each user of the group is mapped to a database connection via a database login. (Col 7 line 47 – Col 8 line 5)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6, 12, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis (US 7,062,563) in view of Freeman et al. – hereinafter Freeman (US 2001/0049717).

As per claims 6, 12, and 18, Lewis discloses the method of claim 1. Lewis fails to disclose further comprising the step of load balancing query volume associated with the at least one database. Freeman discloses further comprising the step of load balancing query volume associated with the at least one database. ([0476]) At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to load balancing query volume associated with the at least one database in the disclosure of Lewis. The motivation for doing so would have been to be efficient. ([0476])

(10) Response to Argument

A) 1. Applicant argues: Lewis fails to disclose “enabling a user to submit a user identification input and a user request to a reporting system”

Response to A) 1.

Lewis discloses per Column 5 lines 49-60, “Databases (and other LDAP clients) refer to entries in the directory information system to determine enterprise user authorization at login.” Lewis further discloses mapping a user to a database per Col 7 line 47 – Col 8 line 5, “Mapping objects comprise another object class useable in the invention. As described in more detail below, these objects are used for schema assignments, to map enterprise users to local database schemas.” Examiner had read “directory information system” as a “reporting system” and is consistently read in light of applicant’s specification as examiner fails to see an explicit definition of “reporting system”.

A review of applicant’s specification discloses per Page 1, lines 5-10, “ The present invention relates generally to implementing security features for reporting systems, such as decision support, Business Intelligence, on-line analytical processing and other systems, in particular, to a method and system for implementing database connection mapping for mapping a user who may be associated with a group of users to an appropriate database via a database connection wherein the database connection comprises information for locating and logging into the appropriate database”. Applicant’s specification also discloses per page 3, lines 14-17, “The present invention

relates generally to implementing security features for reporting systems, such as decision support, Business Intelligence, on-line analytical processing and other systems, in particular, to a method and system for implementing database connection mapping for mapping a user who may be associated with a group of users to an appropriate database via a database connection wherein the database connection comprises information for locating and logging into the appropriate database.” The examiner has read the claims in light of the specification as clearly shown above.

A) 2. Applicant argues: Lewis fails to disclose “controlling access to at least one database through a centralized server the centralized server maps the user to at least one appropriate database based on the user request”

Response to A) 2.

Lewis discloses “controlling access to at least one database through a centralized server wherein the centralized server maps the user to at least one appropriate database based on the user request.” Lewis discloses mapping a user to a database per Col 7 line 47 – Col 8 line 5, “Mapping objects comprise another object class useable in the invention. As described in more detail below, these objects are used for schema assignments, to map enterprise users to local database schemas.” Lewis discloses per Col 1 line 53-Col 2 line 2, “Accordingly, the present invention provides an improved method and system for managing access information for users and other entities in a distributed computing system. In an embodiment of the present invention, information relating to user access (e.g., name, authentication information,

and user roles) is stored in a centralized directory. When the user connects to the database, the database looks up the necessary information about the user in the directory. In an embodiment, the present invention addresses the user, administrative, and security challenges described above by centralizing storage and management of user-related information in an LDAP-compliant directory service. When an employee changes jobs in such an environment, the administrator need only modify information in one location--the directory--to make effective changes in multiple databases and systems. This centralization lowers administrative costs and improves enterprise security."

To further add, Lewis Col 10 line 53 – Col 11 line 3 discloses "The present invention provides a method and mechanism (referred to herein as "current user links") for providing connection links as a current user from a first database to a second database without requiring explicit transmission of authentication credentials in the network link between the databases. According to an embodiment, the link to the remote database is embedded into the stored object that is executed. By embedding the database link in a stored object (such as a procedure, view, or trigger), the owner of the stored object can ensure that connection is made using the owner's security context. When any user runs a stored object, the privilege domain of the object owner is used. In an embodiment, this occurs by passing the DN of the current user from the first database to the second database. The transmitted DN is used to map the connected user to the appropriate schema at the second database and for authorizing privileges. Mapping objects may be used to perform this mapping at remote databases."

B. Applicant argues: Claim 2 is Separately Patentable

Response to B)

Lewis discloses wherein the database connection definition comprises a data source name and a set of properties for establishing a database connection to at least one database per Col 10 lines 37-52, " Unlike a connected-user link, a named link contains both the connect string and the appropriate user credentials (e.g., username/password or other authentication information) for the relevant account on the remote server."

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., thus, the links disclosed in Lewis are between databases) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Examiner fails to see , " the links disclosed in Lewis are between databases" in the recited claim language. Examiner asserts that Lewis discloses "wherein the database connection definition comprises a data source name and a set of properties for establishing a database connection *to at least one database*" as claimed in the recited claim language.

C. Applicant argues: The Rejection Of Claims 6,12, and 18 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Response to C)

Please see the discussion above.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Chirag Patel

/C. R. P./

Examiner, Art Unit 2141

Conferees:

Jason Cardone

/Jason D Cardone/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2145

/Rupal D. Dharia/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2141

Rupal Dharia